DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 643 EC 091 910

TITLE	Provision for the Physically Disabled: A Report to the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education by a Resource Group on the Physically Disabled in Connecticut Postsecondary Education.
REPORT NO	75-P-55-(c)-017; 75-H-80-017
PUB DATE	May 75
NOTE	93p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Architectural Barriers; Aurally Handicapped; *Communication Problems; Design Needs; *Educational Needs; Federal Legislation; *Minority Groups; *Physically Handicapped; Post Secondary Education; School Services; Visually Handicapped
IDENTIFIERS	Connecticut; Public Law 90 576; Pulic Law 93 112; Vocational Rehabilitation Act

ABSTRACT

Presented is a report to the Connecticut Commission for Higher Education by an independent resource group on the accessibility of Connecticut postsecondary education for the blind, deaf, and physically disabled. The report considers the following provisions for the physically handicapped: acquiring funding for removal of physical and communication barriers as provided in the 1968 Ammendment to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act; the requirements for accessibility to buildings for the disabled; difficulty in establishing data on the number of disabled; nonphysical barriers in colleges such as communication barriers, minority affiliation, and the admissions process; the absence of minorities as students in Connecticut colleges including the blind and deaf; inadequate precollege preparation; supportive services such as volunteers, testing arrangements, and preregistration for classes; and future provisions for disabled persons. Appended are responses to a mobility survey; the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 93-112), excerpts from Trio Program Manual, excerpts from Public Law 90-576 on vocational education, and charts on the accessibility of education facilities. (PT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED131643

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Document Nos.
75-F-55(c)-017
75-M-80-017

PROVISION FOR THE PHYSICALLY DISABLED

A REPORT

TO

THE CONNECTICUT COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

BY

A RESOURCE GROUP ON

THE PHYSICALLY DISABLED IN CONNECTICUT POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

MAY 1975
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT

This report is the work of an Independent Resource Group, and not of the Commission staff. The recommendations do not necessarily represent the position of the Commission.

FC 09910

MEMBERS

RESOURCE GROUP ON PHYSICALLY DISABLED

Joseph Mulhall, Chairman
Gaylord Hospital
Wallingford

Dr. Phillip B. Arnold
Chief, Rehabilitation Services
Gaylord Hospital
Wallingford

Clare Baker
Woodbridge

Andrew J. Bunda, Jr.
Dean of Students
Hartford State Technical College
Hartford

Cheryl Comiskey
Library Services to the Handicapped
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Michael Cwickla
Veterans Administration
Hartford

Ann Dandrow
Southington

Elizabeth Davis
Easter Seal Society
Hartford

Roberta Diddel
Middletown

Rosemary Farnsworth
Northwestern Connecticut Community College
Winsted

Richard Keller
University of Hartford

Frances Koenig
Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven

Arnold Lawrence
Lawrence Architects
Manchester

Janet Lowe
Storrs

Russell F. Martin
Minority Involvement in Higher Education
New Haven

James Maxwell
Counselling Services
Mattatuck Community College
Waterbury

Reverend Howard May
West Willington

Peter J. Owsley, Director
Mystic Oral School
Mystic

William E. Patton, Director
Board of Education and Services for the Blind
Wethersfield

James S. Peters, II
Associate Commissioner
Connecticut Division of Vocational Rehabilitation
Connecticut State Department of Education
Hartford

Fred Simons
Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs
University of Connecticut
Storrs

(More)

Resource Group on Physically Disabled (cont'd)

George Tenney
Counselling Services
Central Connecticut
State College
New Britain

Mary Tincovitch
Library for Blind and Physically
Handicapped
State Library
Hartford

Phyllis Zlotnick
West Hartford

SUBCOMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS

	Subcommittee on
Cheryl Comiskey	Blindness
Peter J. Owsley	Deafness
Phillip Arnold	Mobility Handicaps
Fred Simons	Minorities

STAFF ASSOCIATE

Leigh Phillips	University of Connecticut

PREFACE

If the content of this report seems familiar, it should. Its theme--the need in higher education for better supportive services for the physically handicapped--is not unlike the much publicized need for equal opportunity for minorities and women.

The report of the Resource Group on the Physically Handicapped is also about equal opportunity and discrimination, about educational disadvantage and unemployment. It is about the one out of seven persons in Connecticut who is disabled and about the one in four able persons who is likely to become disabled permanently or temporarily.[1] It is also about those individuals who are doubly or triply disadvantaged because they are physically handicapped as well as members of minority groups and/or women. In short, this is a report about the needs of all individuals who are excluded from full participation in society for any reason, but most particularly because they are deaf, blind or lack free mobility.

Education will not solve all their problems, but the lack of it will perpetuate many. Education can furnish the tools with which to compete, without which everyone is handicapped. It can prevent economic disenfranchisement and enable many handicapped persons to become productive citizens despite their physical disabilities. The costs need not be prohibitive; a number of sources of potential funding are not being tapped at present by

Connecticut institutions.

The report on the following pages describes some of the specific problems to be overcome and recommends ways in which higher education can open up opportunities to more of the state's physically handicapped.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Letter of Transmittal	
Resource Group Membership	iii
Preface	v
PROVISIONS FOR THE PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	1
Funding	2
Access	12
Data Base	19
Nonphysical Barriers	25
Minorities	29
Precollege Preparation	39
Supportive Services	46
Future Planning	56
Notes	67
Bibliography	69
Appendix A Responses to Mobility Survey	75
B Vocational Rehabilitation Act	81
C Excerpt from TRIO Program Manual	83
D Excerpt from Part C, Public Law 90-576	85
E Accessibility of Educational Facilities	87

PROVISIONS FOR THE PHYSICALLY DISABLED

The need for facilities and services at Connecticut's post-secondary institutions which will enable disabled citizens of Connecticut the option of education within the state with minimal inconvenience or disadvantage is not questioned. The concerns of those asked to provide the required facilities and services is not whether the need is valid but how such accommodation can be provided within the fiscal limitations of college budgets and state coffers. The Resource Group shared this concern and made an effort to assess the potential economic impact of each recommendation and to identify funding resources.

The Goal is Mobility, a booklet published by the Social Rehabilitation Services of HEW in 1969, says: "Under 1968 Ammendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, states can use their regular formula grants for the removal of architectural barriers as well as for other 'group services' that help disabled people obtain the training and employment that will make them independent."[2] The document points out further that many federal programs authorize support for barrier-free projects but that the authorizations are rarely used.[3] Discussion with agency representatives in Connecticut indicates this to be true. In regard to removal of architectural barriers, few, if any, of the state's

postsecondary educational institutions have applied for funding.

It is important to understand that, contrary to the belief that no money is available for barrier removal projects, such projects are being funded. As evidence, the University of Michigan has received $309,000 to remove the barriers. Eighty percent of the funds were provided by HEW through the Michigan Department of Vocational Rehabilitation; the remaining 20 percent are matching funds provided by the University. The University of Maine also received $94,000 through their state Rehabilitation Agency this year.

FUNDS AVAILABLE

For the present fiscal year, 1974-75, Connecticut received $6 million in Vocational Education funds under PL 90-576. A minimum of ten percent of those funds is earmarked for programs for the disabled. Community and technical colleges may apply for these funds which can be used for construction and renovation, supportive services, certain personnel costs and equipment.

Several other states have developed career programs on the postsecondary level. For example, Missouri offers programs at a community college and junior college, which receive vocational education funds. In these two programs, 25 percent and 50 percent of the funds respectively go to the handicapped.

Many disabled students are educationally disadvantaged for a variety of reasons including inadequate academic preparation for

postsecondary education and insufficient integration into conventional educational programs because of architectural and communication barriers. These students may require the support of remedial education, tutorial assistance and specially adapted media or facilities in order to obtain access to and participation in postsecondary programs. Little attention has been given to the fact that Title IV TRIO programs (PL 92-318) which provide for supportive services to the disadvantaged cite as a target population the physically disabled. It must be pointed out also that there is a population of doubly disadvantaged individuals due to a combination of disability and race. Opportunities for postsecondary education for these persons is not just limited, it is virtually nonexistent.

The program for the disabled at the University of California at Berkeleywas one of eight such programs funded under the Student Special Services Section of Title IV. A recommendation, which is gathering support, has been made to Congress that $4 million be appropriated to be used for the disabled for the fiscal year '75-'76 in Title IV programs.

Provision of library services for the disabled is a major concern of this report, especially in the areas of communication disability. Blindness, deafness and perceptual-motor disabilities prevent full access to and utilization of educational programs without appropriate media. Funds are available to higher education institutions under the Education of the Handicapped Act VIF (PL 91-230) for the provision of media services.

Title I of the Library Services and Construction Act provides funds for state libraries for the purpose of extending library services to the physically disabled. The State Library presently has considerable resources available for the blind and physically handicapped. These media resources and equipment could provide significant service alone or in conjunction with educational institutions if the program received financial support commensurate with the demonstrated need for services. However, the State Library currently has tape duplicating equipment which is unused because of insufficient staff and there are indications that services presently provided are to be cut further if Title I funds specifically for the purpose of providing these services are insufficient. Media services in general are fragmented at best, so it is increasingly important that alternatives to present media delivery systems be developed which can more efficiently provide required services for those persons with communication disabilities.

These are a few of the more easily identified focal areas for possible funding. Many federal programs include provisions for the physically disabled although the primary intent of the funds is more general, for example, housing and transportation. Others which do not specifically identify the disabled may be applicable in certain areas of need.

GUIDELINES UNCLEAR

Campus officials have all heard that millions of dollars in federal funds are available for programs for the disabled if applications are made. The problem is obviously not so easily solved. Insufficient sensitivity among campus fiscal officers to the needs of disabled students and the applicability of conventional funding resources can not be denied. However, much of the confusion over available funds must be placed at the door of the federal agencies. If, as has been stated previously, funds available for the removal of architectural barriers are not applied for, the implication is not lack of willingness to apply on the part of institutions but insufficient information and guidelines for application. Clarification of the presumed advocacy of these programs and services for the disabled is mandatory, especially in the light of recent Affirmative Action legislation which stipulates nondiscrimination against the disabled by contractors or subcontractors receiving more than $2500 in federal funds. The need for clarification can be cited for much of the foregoing material. To use as an example the Title IV TRIO Programs, descriptive literature for application uses the term "disadvantaged" exclusively, while the enabling legislation Title I-A of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 amends Title IV to include the physically disabled.

Searching out possible resources is a time-consuming task and one in which familiarity with the supportive needs of disabled

students is required. Needs will vary from campus to campus, and in terms of the higher education system as a whole, coordination of the development of programs is necessary for efficient use of available resources, without unnecessary duplication and competition for funds. Few campus personnel with the direct responsibility for the welfare of disabled students have time for the necessary research and proposal writing, and fiscal officers often lack necessary information and sensitivity to needs. A person knowledgeable in areas of need and resources, and familiar with individual campuses, should be available for advice and information on the state level.

Coordination of program and facilities development could provide a wide range of educational opportunities for the disabled which are not presently available in the state. This could be accomplished within a short period of time without prohibitive expense to the individual institutions. It is important that the best programs possible be developed without unnecessary competition for limited resources. For certain programs, producing duplicate quality would be too expensive. The expense of duplicating extensive supportive services for the comparatively small population of deaf students to be served on each campus would be prohibitive. Some services can and should be provided for the deaf on each campus but their cost is minimal at most.

Consortium arrangements among institutions in close geographic proximity could provide services for the disabled more efficiently and economically than if each duplicated similar programs and/or

services. A cooperative library program between institutions could more uniformly provide appropriate media for all blind, physically disabled and learning disabled students who require special media.

A consortium approach has the potential for providing a comprehensive delivery system for postsecondary education in a much shorter time and at less cost than would be possible through planning and the extensive renovation of buildings at several locations. It is recognized that a plan for the system-wide removal of architectural barriers is intimidating to state and campus fiscal officers. However, a more creative and flexible approach to the delivery of education could provide access for the disabled that is less painful fiscally while planning for full future accessibility on individual campuses.

It is not acceptable that potential cost for providing services stand as a reason for inaction or lack of planning. It is important that a sound data base be established and priorities set for the removal of architectural barriers. The New Mexico state legislature recently mandated a survey and cost analysis for the correction of existing architectural barriers in all of its public institutions of higher education. The state's Office of Educational Finance estimated a cost of $3 million for correction. Simultaneously, it was found that by applying the proper logistics and scheduling techniques, the whole spectrum of programs offered in the state could be made accessible for $300 thousand. Extending this idea to the regional consortium concept, cross registration between institutions, based on architectural accessibility of

subject areas, dormitories and locations of extracurricular activities, would require fewer renovation projects while providing educational oppurtunity for the disabled. Components essential for providing a wide range of opportunity in the near future rests primarily, in this context, on institutional coordination and transportation. Mechanisms for cooperation and coordination are currently being planned. Transportation is one of the "group services" which qualify for funding under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act and recent Urban Mass Transit guidelines offer additional possibilities in this area.

FUNDING RESOURCES

RECOMMENDATION 1: *That an office be established in the Commission for Higher Education or in another constituent unit to provide a clearing house of information on programs in and out of the state of Connecticut, and on funding resources, with the office to serve as an advisory and review center on all new building plans regarding accessibility provisions and program development.*

NEED FOR STATE RESPONSIBILITY

It is unrealistic to assume that federal funds, even if readily available for each campus, would be adequate to remove many of the existing physical and communication barriers, nor should an attitude of total federal responsibility for the needs of disabled students prevail. The state has much to gain from an educated, employed, disabled citizenry and the training schools and colleges themselves can receive benefits from full integration

of disabled students, faculty, and staff. Both should assume some responsibility for providing the opportunity for education and employment which will enable the disabled individual to contribute to the society and improve his standard of living.

Philosophically, the exclusion of any segment of state population from the benefits to be obtained from education--whether the group is women, older adults, or minorities--has been considered detrimental to the society and contrary to the basic ideals of the educational community. Considerable effort has been made to correct inequities which waste human potential and state and institutional funding has been recognized as a legitimate response to the needs of groups previously disenfranchised from the educational system. Provision of facilities accessible to the disabled should be considered a supportive service in much the same manner as the provision of financial aid and day-care facilities which can significantly reduce barriers for minorities and women. To treat needs of the disabled as unrelated to the needs of many students who have special requirements but who are not physically disabled and to maintain this separation in budget considerations creates an artificial barrier to the integration of disabled into the educational institutions and, perhaps more importantly, to the work force. It can not be stressed too strongly that the disabled are not "special" because of their disability but because of their exclusion from their nondisabled peers.

Long-range planning and provisional funding should be provided for the progressive removal of existing barriers and the prevention of their incorporation into new construction. Many of Connecticut's older postsecondary educational institutions have existing structures which may require extensive alteration to provide accessibility. The cost of renovation of older buildings is known to be expensive. However, no data base presently exists for documenting the extent of necessary renovation or the cost of correction of identified barriers. Lack of information and formulation of priorities continues to perpetuate assumptions which may or may not be valid concerning the expense involved. Such assumptions have seriously limited progress because of the spectre of financial chaos associated with commitment to full accessibility.

The removal of architectural barriers should not be treated as an all-or-nothing proposition. It is obvious that many barriers could be easily removed which have not been, others will require large expenditures, and still others may have to be outlived because of prohibitive renovation cost. Some of these corrections are within the capability of institutional budgets. The large projects may require capital appropriations from the state, federal, or private funds.

IN OTHER STATES

Sixteen of Connecticut's peer states in per capita income have at least one barrier-free college or are in the process of

planning or implementing the removal of barriers in one or more of their higher education facilities. Four of these states - Illinois, Ohio, California and Michigan - have several accessible postsecondary institutions. Many of the peer states have made impressive progress in providing physical accessibility and other supportive service programs in all units of their postsecondary education institutions. Pennsylvania has initiated and requested funding for a planned barrier-removal project for three of its colleges. Florida has approached the provision of services on a system-wide basis and is attempting to provide accessible facilities throughout the system. Colorado has completed a survey of its postsecondary institutions, and an in-depth study and cost analysis has been completed for the removal of barriers at the University of Delaware. Other states, notably New Mexico, Texas, North Carolina and Arizona, are making significant progress in providing accessibility to their state postsecondary facilities. For more information on these and other states, see Appendix A.

The institutions noted have achieved their progress in a variety of ways; legislative mandate, state appropriations, institutional line-item budget funds and private foundation grants. In no instance was or is the process of eliminating barriers easy to solve. The University of Illinois has taken 28 years to reach its present status as a model of the barrier-free university. It is important to stress that the majority of program development in the area of accessibility to public postsecondary education, as opposed to special institutional schools

for the blind, deaf, and physically disabled, has occurred since 1968. The key to the development of most of these programs has been administrative support and commitment to seeking the required funding while providing support and flexibility within the institution which would allow a disabled student to cope with existing barriers with a minimum of inconvenience. Flexibility in scheduling classes and events can provide accessibility at minimal expense, given a responsive educational community. Progress may be slower than desired, but quality programs develop when the conviction exists that the effort is justified.

WHAT IS REQUIRED

Major attention to accessible facilities has been devoted to buildings constructed prior to legislation requiring accessibility to the disabled in new construction. Unfortunately, many of Connecticut's facilities constructed or renovated since 1968 have incorporated - by oversight, design, or attempt to cut costs - a variety of barriers which have perpetuated accessibility problems for the disabled which the laws were intended to eliminate. Three major concerns were identified in the construction of new facilities: insufficient involvement in the planning stage of persons knowledgeable about the specifications for accessible facilities; confusion between state and federal accessibility requirements, and concern about the cost of incorporating the provisions of the American National Standards Institute specifications (ANSI A117.1)

for making facilities accessible to and usable by the physically disabled in new construction design.

The planning stage of a new building or renovation of an older one must be the focal point for the elimination of errors regarding accessibility provisions. Architects' plans must be checked for compliance with state or federal requirements and such compliance should be an enforceable contract provision of both architects and contractors involved in the construction or renovation of a facility. The expense of contractual change orders once the project is in process, or corrections after the completion of a project, in general prevent any changes being effected in contracts or any structural errors being corrected. The result has been ramps built at precipitous angles and widths, doorways that are too narrow or the absence of curb cuts or ramps to the exterior of otherwise accessible facilities. Multi-story buildings have been constructed without passenger elevators or with inaccessible levels on various floors when elevators are available. The problems are often the result of the design. Polls of local officials and architects in 1969 indicated that 40 percent of city officials and 30 percent of county officials were unaware of the need for barrier-free programs and that only 28 percent of architects used the ANSI specifications in designing buildings. Queries to manufacturers and suppliers of building materials and to building code groups also indicated little knowledge of or use of data on environmental barriers.[4] Awareness has increased to some extent since that time but anachronisms evident in the design and construction of new facilities

indicate that little understanding has been used in interpreting provision for the disabled in building design.

Confusion over accessibility requirements for state or federal projects has been cited as a reason for many of the problems with new construction.[5] While this seems to call into question the interpretation of all building regulations and codes, the differences in present state and federal requirements regarding accessibility bear comment.

State law currently requires the provisions for accessibility in new facilities specified in Article 21 of the State Building Code. Vagueness, insufficient enforceability and waivers of certain provisions have made minimal attention to accessibility, if not condoned, accepted. The few provisions which are explicit--the width of doors, angle of ramps, height of control buttons--are frequently ignored. Article 21 also applies to renovations of existing structures if the building is to be "substantially altered."

Structures built in whole or in part with federal grants or loans since 1968 are generally required to meet the ANSI specifications (PL 90-480). For existing buildings, if repairs or alterations involve less than 25 percent of the value of the building, compliance is not required. Remodeling which costs 25 to 50 percent of the building value must meet requirements in the remodeled area and change in excess of 50 percent necessitates compliance in the entire structure.[6] Little difference can be noted in the provision or problems evident in new facilities

whether funding is state or federal.

If inadequate attention is given to the design of new facilities, even less is evident in renovation projects. Considerable question continues as to whether building plans drawn up prior to 1968 and shelved for several years must meet present accessibility requirements. Accessibility features are thus jeopardized in both new construction and remodeling of facilities.

It is important that guidelines be established for all parties concerned in the construction or renovation of facilities and that accountability be mandatory in all stages of the projects for architects, the Public Works Department, contractors, inspectors, and higher education institutions themselves. Presently accountability is impossible to establish and "error" often seems more attributable to inattention than confusion.

While considerable comment has been made concerning the expense of incorporating the provisions of the (117.1) ANSI specifications, little documentation has been offered, except verbally, to that effect. Studies have been done, however, which indicate that the incremental increase in cost is negligible. The National League of Cities did a cost study of three new inaccessible buildings: a civic center, a city hall, and a hotel. A comparison of the building cost to the projected cost if accessibility features had been incorporated resulted in a difference of less than one-tenth of one percent. Cost estimates of seven hypothetical buildings of common construction also were done. The extra cost of building them barrier-free was estimated at one-half

of one percent. The General Services Administration notes that the cost of removing architectural barriers when other renovations are being made is "approximately one percent of the renovation cost" (p. 23 of *The Goal is Mobility*).

In certain cases waivers may be valid, but potential for abuse exists in the degree of administrative latitude given to the Public Works Department. Approval for waivers of the provisions is most often based on undue financial hardship if they are required. The Resource Group feels that a claim of hardship should be clarified and substantial documentation required and certified before provisions are waived.

The Connecticut General Assembly is currently considering the adoption of the ANSI specifications. A concern is that adoption of the specifications will not substantially alter the status quo without more comprehehensive design and review procedures. Public Works officials have indicated that errors which are not detected in the early stages of the project are often the result of insufficient staff to spend the time required to check plans for accuracy, rather than due to waivers of provisions. In either case, there are significant problems in some of our new buildings and rather than try to correct them after construction, it is necessary to prevent them in future construction.

Similar problems in South Carolina, which had previously adopted the ANSI specifications, has resulted in that state adopting by law a Barrier-Free Design Board, composed of six members, two of whom are disabled, to set guidelines and review

requests for waivers. The Board includes a licensed architect, the head of the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, the State Chief Engineer and the Public Works Commissioner. With extensive documentation, waivers may be granted for expenses in excess of seven percent of the total cost of the project.

While certain of the provisions for accessibility are expensive--for example elevators which are the major point of controversy, and wall-mounted or recessed water closets which for some reason are left out more often than elevators--little study has been done concerning cost/benefit over the period of the life of the building. Virtually all opposition to some provision is in regard to savings on initial costs. This is a short-term benefit, but fiscally attractive at the present time. In educational facilities classes can usually be scheduled around inaccessible locations; that is rarely the case with employment. The potential penalties in terms of federal funding should enter into cost considerations as well as the potential benefits to the state of educated and employed disabled citizens.

ARCHITECTURAL BARRIER SURVEY

RECOMMENDATION 2: *That within one year the Commission for Higher Education and the constituent units require an in-depth architectural barrier survey of each campus, utilizing disabled students to assist, if possible, in the actual survey and the formulation of the survey instrument, and that the clearing house suggested in recommendation #1 develop a single survey instrument for compatibility of resulting information.*

APPROPRIATION OF CAPITAL FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION 3: *That the General Assembly appropriate capital funds over a five-year period for the purpose of correcting identified barriers on a priority basis.*

INSTITUTIONAL FUNDS

RECOMMENDATION 4: *That the General Assembly require each public unit of higher education to allocate a specific amount in its annual construction, maintenance or restoration budget to be used solely for the purpose of campus barrier removal.*

RECOMMENDATION 5: *That initial priorities be stated.*

RECOMMENDATION 6: *That at least one graduate-degree granting institution provide modified dormitory facilities, transportation for students in wheelchairs or on crutches, and a full range of supportive services for blind, deaf, and physically disabled students.*

RECOMMENDATION 7: *That an investigation be made of the potential of consortia to provide access to postsecondary education based on sharing of facilities and services and to utilize the resources of the public and private higher education institutions, proprietary schools and the Board for State Academic Awards.*

AMERICAN NATIONAL STANDARDS INSTITUTE (A 117.1) (R 1971) SPECIFICATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 8: *That the ANSI (A 117.1) specifications for making facilities accessible to and usable by the physically disabled*

(a) be adopted and enforced for all new state-funded higher education facilities and

(b) be enforced for all education facilities constructed with federal funds.

DATA-GATHERING DIFFICULTIES

Questions must arise as to whether large expenditures to remove architectural and communication barriers can be justified considering the relatively small numbers of disabled students presently in the state's postsecondary institutions. The major difficulty encountered by the Resource Group in compiling information for this report was in obtaining reliable statistics in order to answer the question "How many"?

The large numbers of hospitals, rehabilitation centers, and public and private agencies keeping records and their manner of reporting confuses the question more than it clarifies. Definitions of categories of disability vary from agency to agency as do age groupings for the disabled. For example, cerebral palsy is included in Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (DVR) statistics for orthopedic handicaps, but is listed as a separate category by the Health Department. The primary age group covered by DVR is between 18 and 45; by the Health Department, 0-19; and by Vocational Education, ages 14 to 21, which overlaps with both of the others. Social Security statistics cover the age range of 16-64. Vital information is obscured in a barrage of numbers which have little meaning in terms of real numbers of potential students. Frequently, we were given state estimates based on federal estimates or population ratios based on census data, which are questionable when variables such as criteria for reporting and socioeconomic status are considered. For example, state-

ments such as the following by Dr. Jacob Fried of the Jewish Braille Institute of America and Harold Russell, Chairman, President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, should be considered in evaluating the validity of much of the data presented in this section. The handicapped are "in all segments of society, but mostly in the lower socioeconomic groups," according to Dr. Fried. In Mr. Russell's words, "the incidence of the handicapped in ghettos must be three times that of the suburbs".[7]

It became obvious early in this study that it would be a much easier task to document objectively the extent and degree of architectural barriers than to identify with authority the numbers of disabled individuals who would benefit by their removal. With the reservations stated, the following statistics were furnished by the four Resource Group Subcommittees.

Perhaps the most reliable information was furnished by the Subcommittee on the Blind. This is so because the Board of Education Services for the Blind (BESB) follows blind clients from preschool age through all levels of education, while several agencies are often involved with deaf and otherwise disabled at various stages of their educational careers. The BESB has 4621 registered clients out of an estimated total of 6100 blind individuals in the state. Five hundred and fifty-four of these clients are between five and 19 years of age. Eight hundred and thirty-two blind persons between the ages of 20 and 44 are registered.. These 1386 clients were considered to be potential entrants to or able to benefit from some form of posts condary

education, either in-training or retraining programs. Currently 116 blind students from Connecticut are being funded by the agency for postsecondary education programs. Thirty-five of them are attending out-of-state institutions. Projected enrollment of Connecticut's blind students in postsecondary education is expected to increase to 130 a year by 1980. Sex distribution of the caseload is 47 percent male/53 percent female. Ethnic distribution based on the 1970 census is estimated at 93.5 percent white, 6.0 percent Negro, .5 percent other, or 4321, 277, and 23, respectively.[8] The subcommittee also listed the presence of 25,000 pupils in the public school system with perceptual-motor disabilities with needs similar to blind students for supportive services.[9]

The categories of deaf and mobility disabled are more difficult to establish as no single agency has responsibility for maintaining records. These disabled individuals may be found in records of day and residential schools, public schools, (mainstreaming or in special education classes) vocational/technical schools, and colleges. The major sources of information are day and residential school enrollments, the Board of Education (Special Education, Vocational Education) and in the records of the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. They may also be recorded in statistics available from the Public Health Department, Division of Crippled Children, The Social Security Administration, and from private agencies such as the Easter Seal Society or research groups such as the Rand Corporation and the Urban Institute.

There are an estimated 1000 deaf children in day and residential schools in Connecticut.[10] Approximately 70 graduate from high school each year. Special Education classes in the state for 1973-74 enrolled 984 hearing-impaired students in preschool through grade 12, with an estimated additional 439 who were unidentified and therefore unserved.[11] The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation lists 631 hearing-impaired clients in its '73-'74 caseload.[12] While these numbers add up to approximately 3054 hearing-impaired persons in the school system, this cannot be considered the total deaf population of the state who are potential entrants to postsecondary education.

Special Education records for 1973-74 list 1114 identified physically disabled children and an additional 509 physically disabled students in the public schools who are not in special classes. The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation caseload for 1973-74 includes 2575 orthopedically impaired clients and 208 clients with missing limbs. An approximate total of mobility-disabled individuals in state schools or postsecondary training is 4406.

Collection of data on disability is, to say the least, confusing and frustrating. State agencies administering federal funds are not required to issue reports on characteristics of state clients. Computer tapes are sent to Washington to be compiled with similar data from other states into a vocational report. State characteristics are not in a readily retrievable form. Given sufficient lead time and specific data requirements, the

information can be pulled by developing a specific computer program or by doing a case-by-case review. The DVR cooperated with the Resource Group in both ways to provide information on minority representation in their total caseload. The Spinal Cord Injury Department of Yale New Haven Hospital did not have the time to do a case-by-case review. Similarly, the Connecticut Health Department Crippled Children's Division provided estimates for the state based on federal estimates of major disabling conditions of children between 0 and 21. Specific information would have required a case-by-case review for which neither staff nor time was available.

The estimates obtained from three sources for disabled children in Connecticut illuminate the confusion implicit in estimations of disability levels. Estimates obtained from the Health Department indicate a total in 1970 of 113,695 disabled children in Connecticut, 32,440 of whom were estimated to have orthopedic handicaps.[13] The Division of Vocational Rehabilitation estimated a total of handicapped children at 18,726,[14] slightly more than one-half of the Health Department estimate for one category of disability. And the *Vocational Education Evaluation Report Fiscal Year 1972*, prepared by the Connecticut Advisory Council on Vocational Education, cites an estimated total population of handicapped youth at 137,560 by 1976. The Advisory Council estimates further that by 1976 there will be 28,000 disabled students between the ages of 14 and 21. It is apparent that the estimates are in no way comparable.

In the areas of deafness and mobility disablement, the Resource Group could only hope that overlapping of data in some cases would compensate for the obvious gaps in statistical reporting in others, especially of those disabled persons who have not applied for services or been identified by one of the state agencies.

Most of this information has little meaning in terms of real numbers of disabled individuals who are qualified or qualifiable for further education. To a great extent, they are estimates based on estimates. In some cases the mentally retarded were included in totals without being identified as to numbers.

The question "How many?" has not been answered in positive terms. However, it is apparent that the numbers are not small. It is also apparent that there is a need for a central data bank to standardize and tabulate information about disability. Florida has taken an important step in this direction by establishing a central registry for the state disabled.

The higher education community itself is in a position to offer a partial solution to the question and to provide a continuity in educational opportunity that is not evident among the various agencies providing educational services to the disabled. The development of Upward Bound, Talent Search, and Special Services programs could identify talented disabled students in the school system before they become lost in the maze of questionable statistics. Early identification is desirable from both a planning standpoint and to provide a mechanism to facilitate access to

higher education for disabled students.

NONPHYSICAL BARRIERS

Access to higher education for the physically disabled involves broader concerns than the physical ability to use the buildings. Much has been discussed previously in this report on architectural barriers. This section concerning access will assume that the reader understands architectural barriers to be a major problem; thus it will focus on other aspects of accessibility. For many disabled students--the blind, deaf, and those with perceptual-motor disabilities--architectural barriers are insignificant, but often there are overwhelming or unfair communications barriers which jeopardize the individual's opportunities to benefit from the educational process. For virtually all of the major disability groups, there are significant problems related to agency sponsorship, previous education, minority affiliation, and the admissions process.

The majority of students planning to enter postsecondary educational institutions is concerned with only one admissions process. Their other major concern is financial aid. For the disabled aspirant to higher education these concerns are multiplied. The majority of disabled students receiving postsecondary education is sponsored by one of the federally funded state agencies with responsibility for rehabilitation of disabled individuals, such as the Board of Education Services for the Blind, the Division of

Vocational Rehabilitation and the Veterans Administration.

Agency sponsorship for educational services offers opportunity and imposes restrictions for the disabled aspirant to higher education. The criteria for funding an educational plan for a disabled client is based on employability. Statistics available from Social Rehabilitation Services on rehabilitated clients strongly indicate that the employment aspect of services takes precedence over educational capability of clients. Low level and unskilled or semiskilled labor classifications constitute the major percentage of successful case closures. In *Characteristics of Clients Rehabilitated in Fiscal Years 1968-1972,* 52.8 percent of rehabilitated clients had family incomes of less than $250.00 a month; only 11.5 percent had monthly family incomes of over $600.00. It is not surprising that the percentage for income over $600.00 a month closely matches the 11.6 percent of persons rehabilitated who were employed in professional, technical, and managerial occupations, or that the reasonably close percentage (9.2) of rehabilitated clients completed 13 or more grades of education.[15]

By definition, employment at any level is considered a successful rehabilitation.

This is certainly not the ideal of the agency or of the majority of counselors who try to write a plan that represents the best interests and capabilities of their clients. However, the pressure on counselors to provide success statistics in the

form of employed clients at the lowest possible cost per client, [illegible]ously jeopardizes postsecondary opportunities for many persons.

Absence of adequate in-state postsecondary facilities further decreases opportunity for the physically disabled agency client (see Appendix E for facilities inventory). Counselors who must weigh the higher tuition and transportation costs of sending one student out of state against the serving of a larger number in state may decide not to approve an educational plan for which out-of-state services are required. Other students whose plans are approved may find themselves shut out of institutions in other states with appropriate facilities and services because the programs don't have space for the numbers who apply.

Whether disabled individuals are underemployed in the state or sent out of state to school, Connecticut loses revenue. In the first case, it loses tax revenue and public assistance payments; in the second the state General Fund loses the benefit of tuition paid to Connecticut colleges. An estimated 40 orthopedically impaired students have been sent out of state to college in the past two years.[16] Deaf students have had no college program available to them in the state until this year and beyond the community college level these students must still go elsewhere. Many disabled students who attend postsecondary educational institutions in the state have the quality of their education compromised by physical and communication barriers which are more handicapping than their disabilities, frequently resulting in frustration and failure.

In the 1973-74 fiscal year, the Connecticut Division of Vocational Rehabilitation spent close to $1.5 million for postsecondary education services for its disabled clients, yet on many campuses in the state the only person on campus who can identify numbers of disabled students is the bursar. The only regular provision for disabled students is the billing of the sponsoring agency for their tuition and fees.

Communication between postsecondary education institutions and the agencies mandated to provide services for the disabled is virtually nonexistent on every planning level. Liaison between the two areas of education service and delivery is essential to development of provisions for the disabled. It is also essential that disabled individuals have access to conventional financial aid programs, to alleviate the strain on agency resources and to provide financial assistance to disabled individuals who are not agency clients. Dr. Kent B. Kloepping, Director of Special Services for the Disabled at the University of Arizona sums up the problem "...It is assumed (then) that the State-Federal program of Vocational Rehabilitation serves all disabled individuals. In fact, the program is severely pressed to meet the basic training, educational, and other support services required for their clientele. To expect the agency to totally fund all programs of postsecondary education for the severely physically handicapped individuals across the board is unrealistic and represents archaic thinking. The simple economics of money available, increased cost, plus increased client load dictates that once again the most

severely physically disadvantaged will represent the population whose needs will be least effectively served.

"Since the education of handicapped clients may extend over four to six years, the combination of these costs for all clients who could profit from higher education far exceeds the funds available to the Department of Rehabilitation. The result is the inevitable 'rationing' of resources by accepting only the most promising clients (approximately one out of ten) to receive college support."[17]

MINORITIES OVERLOOKED

The Resource Group was concerned about the absence of minority group representation among disabled students presently in college in Connecticut, a fact that is visibly obvious if not statistically documented. Social Security information concerning incidence of disability indicates that a larger percentage of minorities, both male and female, is represented in disability figures, than is represented in the general population. For example, Blacks represent six percent of Connecticut's general population, yet 9.8 percent of disabled males in the state are black and 9.3 percent of disabled females are black.

The Subcommittee on Minorities attempted to document the numbers of disabled minorities in the state and their levels of academic training. Caseload information for 1974 provided by the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation shows the following breakdown:

		% of Total Load
Females	6085	36.2
Negro	2841	16.9
Indian	15	.09
Spanish surname	992	5.9
Other	117	.7

Of those in the agency study, 7.4 percent had completed 13 or more grades of education when service was terminated.

Due to time limitations and confidentiality of client records, it was not possible to ascertain what "13 and up" meant in terms of level of educational support. No breakdown was available by income or professional level. In the absence of information from disabled minority group members, some educated guesses were proffered to explain the lack of visibility of the minority disabled in postsecondary education. Some problems with agency sponsorship have been previously noted in this report. These problems may be compounded for the disabled person who is also a member of an ethnic minority. He or she may be educationally disadvantaged which would increase the risk against completion of an academic program and his/her ethnic affiliation would decrease employment prospects beyond that of disability alone. This combination of factors would make most counselors hesitant to approve a plan for higher education.

It is more difficult to offer an explanation for the absence of minority clients from programs in which the risks are minimized and educational upgrading and supportive services are offered at no cost to the agency. In 1973, the Director of the University of

Connecticut's summer program, and the coordinator of Special Student Services (disabled) in an effort to recruit ten disabled minority students sent a joint letter to all counselors in the state requesting referrals from their caseloads. District supervisors also received the letter. The letter explained that the summer program was subsidized and that supportive services would be provided for both educationally and physically disadvantaged. Only one referral was received and arrangements for an interview were never completed despite several attempts by the Office of Special Student Services.

Dr. Kloepping notes: "It would be an oversimplification to say that the individual who acquires the position of both physical handicap and ethnic minority has merely a doubly disadvantaging condition. The problems for this individual are and have been overlooked and compounded throughout his lifetime."[18] The Resource Group believes it is time to correct this oversight in Connecticut and that efforts be made to identify and offer postsecondary education to this group of disabled persons.

Major attention has been given to the physical disadvantages of disabled individuals. It is important to realize that many are educationally disadvantaged because of societal attitudes about disability and the associated low expectation concerning their educational and intellectual capabilities. As a result, education for many disabled students has suffered.

NEEDS OF THE BLIND

A user/needs survey was sent to blind students currently enrolled in college. Several questions concerned preparedness for college in terms of activities of daily living necessary for independence, ability to cope with discrimination and to comply with admission procedures, testing and media requirements.

Students responding to the survey -- whether satisfied or dissatisfied with their present skills in mobility, cooking, ordering their own books and tapes and other necessary activities -- expressed a common desire for more and earlier training, and the need to practice these skills, not just to be advised.

Lack of these basic skills produces great frustration for the student, affects his performance and may prevent admission into college. One student cited instances where three blind students from a residential school were denied admission to college on the basis of "social immaturity" even though they were academically qualified. The student making the comment indicated that he had been required to endure three separate interviews before admission because the school had "previously had a bad experience with a blind student." Other respondents expressed concern about inadequate preparation for self-sufficiency in performing basic tasks such as meal preparation, maintaining clothing and using transit systems, which had unnecessarily complicated their living away from home or in a dormitory.

Discussions with agency counselors to the blind and with the students themselves traced the basis of the problem to inadequate preparation on the secondary level. While federal legislation has made entrance to public school systems an option for blind students, the lack of supportive services and social integration with sighted peers has caused serious problems for some who chose public over residential schools. The blind student often has no peer group identity and social contact is often limited to niceties of the day. The isolation which frequently results forces blind students into academic retreat with virtually no social life or complete disorientation and failure. The exceptional blind student who can compete academically frequently becomes totally grade oriented as a means of obtaining approval and acceptance. The noncompetitive or average blind students who cannot attain high academic recognition are lost educationally.

While these students receive some help from itinerant teachers from the Board of Education Services for the Blind, the focus is primarily academic. The students are given little emotional support, training in techniques of daily living (TDL), or mobility instruction. Many blind students exhibit mannerisms which are not socially acceptable to their schoolmates, producing further isolation. The public schools provide nothing for blind students in the way of physical education to assist them in developing acceptable physical movement and physical orientation. The student, in isolation, is generally unaware that his mannerisms or movements may be considered unusual behavior.

Residential schools for the blind produce a different but equally deleterious set of problems for development of "social maturity" of their students. Students in these schools have a peer group with which they can identify, but they are given inadequate preparation for life outside the sheltered world of the school. The residential schools are strictly regimented with bells ringing to signal virtually every activity, and social interaction between the sexes is limited and closely supervised. The value system imposed by the residential schools leaves their students ill-equipped emotionally to handle the relative freedom of postsecondary education and lacking basic TDL skills necessary to function independently. While the residential schools are designed to teach mobility and TDL skills, the large numbers of students who require or significantly benefit from the services of institutuions such as the Albany Association for the Blind, indicate the skills are not being adequately taught.

Another reason for the lack of skills was evident in the response of one of the blind students to the questionnaire, who cited a present need for the skills but who, at the time the training was offered, "couldn't have cared less."

Education of teachers in the public school system was noted as especially important as residential school populations drop and more blind students are mainstreaming. Most teachers have little awareness of the capabilities of blind students in their classes, what the students' potential, limitations or problems are. Unusual or distracting behaviour is generally ignored,

resented, or accepted as indigenous to blindness rather than brought to the attention of counselors to the blind who can provide assistance to both teacher and student when a problem is identified. The rocking motion associated with many blind young people, which clears everyone out of their way as they approach, is not normally accepted behaviour and creates unfortunate social barriers with sighted students. An informed teacher could take steps to assist a student exhibiting such behavior to correct mannerisms which have a detrimental effect on his assimilation into the sighted world.

Members of the Resource Group Subcommittee on the Blind believe there is a need for an intensive precollege program for blind students to teach the use of the library and study aids, and how to take notes efficiently, as well as instruction in spelling, typing, book ordering, and mobility instruction. Blind students surveyed cited such needs repeatedly.

PROBLEMS OF THE DEAF

Connecticut has two residential schools for deaf children, Mystic Oral School and the American School for the Deaf (ASD). The philosophy of education at the two schools differs and represents the divergence of thought among educators of the deaf which continues to generate controversy.

Oralist schools such as Mystic focus on teaching the deaf child to speak and lip-read. Sign language is discouraged and

not used in the school. At ASD, the method of instruction is total communication. Lip-reading and sign language are used simultaneously and while speech therapy is available, teaching the child to speak does not receive the same emphasis given by oralist schools. The debate over which is the better method will not be detailed here and is most likely irrelevant to the provision of support at the postsecondary level. It is important, however, that there be some awareness of the needs of both the oral deaf individual and deaf person who requires a manual interpreter. The debate is not likely to be resolved in the near future and need for services for both is a present reality.

Enrollment of deaf children in residential schools is declining. The passage of P.L.1076D mandated the admission of deaf children into the public schools. The intent of the law was to provide equal education for the deaf and the benefits to be gained from integration into the educational mainstream. The method of education is primarily oralist.

Direct interviews were conducted with a limited number of parents of deaf children in the public schools and members of educational and parent organizations, including the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC), Area Cooperative Education Services (ACES) and Parents of Norwalk Hearing Impaired Children. While the survey has little analytical validity because of its limited scope, answers reflected common problems and echoed the concerns expressed in a recent report by the Office of Legislative Research on *Special Education Delivery Systems in Five Connecticut Towns*

for the Education Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly:

1) uneven special education from town to town;

2) lack of sufficient testing and evaluation procedures in some programs;

3) variable degrees of contact and rapport between regular teacher and the special education teacher;

4) wide variability in adequacy of diagnosis and planning procedures;

5) weakness in monitoring and review of the progress of integrated special education children;

6) insufficient parent understanding of the child's disability, and

7) lack of outreach programs to assist parents in understanding and helping their children.[19]

The same report states that parent awareness is deficient in most areas of disability: "Only the parents of the hearing impaired children had organized themselves and this was due to the fact that originally the school system resisted hiring a learning impairment teacher. These parents initiated self-education programs and regularly made efforts to monitor teaching methods in the school."[20]

Communications with the Resource Group from parents revealed deep concern for the quality of education their children are receiving and what options will be available to them for post-secondary education. Many expressed the feeling that the intent of legislation to provide equal education for deaf children in the

public school system has been undermined in many school districts by lack of mechanics or an unwillingness to integrate the child into classes with hearing children.

Responses varied in degree of concern or approval noted for public school systems in which their children were enrolled.

The Norwalk school system was cited as having an excellent program for the hearing impaired from kindergarten through high school. Supportive services include an academic tutor who is a trained teacher of the deaf, a speech and language therapist who is also a trained teacher of the deaf, and phonic ear equipment. The children are fully integrated academically and in school activities. Regular performance testing is done and good communication exists between teachers and parents. Students in the program compare favorably with their hearing peers in reading level.

The Norwalk system is exemplary but it is not by any means the norm. The mother of a profoundly deaf child, responding to the survey, described the opposite extreme. The child was placed in a Learning Disabled class of ten pupils, where the only integration with hearing students was at lunch in the cafeteria. The school has no teacher of the deaf, no equipment, no performance testing that the parent was aware of, and little parent/teacher communication. This parent eloquently stated, "All deaf children should have a teacher of the deaf <u>especially</u> if there are only one or two deaf kids in a school system. They shouldn't be deprived of a normal education and integration into a regular class when possible. The school should have close parent/teacher communication.

It is so vital for the deaf child to know they are working together. The schools must be willing to provide the proper equipment (sound). The school systems should be a little more educated about deaf children's needs. Psychologists, social workers and special education teachers do not understand the impact of deafness on a child or his family...."

Most comments from the parents of deaf children in the public school system fell between the two extremes cited. Unanimous agreement, however, was expressed on the need for teacher education and ongoing (including summer vacation) tutorial assistance in speech, language, and reading to give deaf students adequate preparation for postsecondary education.

INADEQUATE PRECOLLEGE PREPARATION

It is disturbing that the quality of both the academic and social preparation of disabled young people for career training or higher education is to a great extent questionable. A low level of expectation for the future training opportunities for handicapped young people was noted among educators directly concerned with special education as well as among agencies designed to serve the needs of the disabled. While the problems may be most profound for certain types of disability, indications are that the attitudes are generic.

Special education classes have been required to function in ways for which they were not designed or intended. Special

education teachers, relegated to a function between caretaker and miracle worker, are frequently educationally unprepared and/or without necessary resources to effectively deal with the variety of educational needs demonstrated by their students. Learning disabled classes are an example: The term "learning disability" as defined by some school systems has become semantically loaded to the point of being virtually unrecognizable as a definition of perceptual-motor disability. Often it is used as a catchall category for any educational problem. Special education teachers of a learning disabled class may be expected to meet needs of students who are blind or deaf or those who have perceptual-motor disabilities, or emotional and behavioral problems.

Part of the problem is financial. The funding level for special education is insufficient to provide adequate staff, equipment and facilities to meet the needs of the various disabilities. Another and perhaps the major problem which permeates the entire educational structure, is attitudinal. Special education classes unfortunately often have to absorb many problems that the school system is unwilling or unable to deal with. This has been a detriment to the state of the art in special education and to the education of handicapped young people. There is certainly a need for special education classes just as there is a need for residential schools for some handicapped students. Many of the students, however, could and should be mainstreamed. In many cases the intent of special education to provide the mechanism and expertise necessary for the successful integration of disabled students into the

public school system has been subverted. School principals and teachers, reluctant to accept disabled students, have used the existence of special education classes as an excuse to opt out of responsibility for the education of these students in regular classrooms. The education of the regular classroom teacher in regard to identification of disability and understanding of the capabilities and limitations of blind, deaf, and physically handicapped students, and students with perceptual-motor disabilities, was cited by members of the Resource Group as important at all levels of the educational process, but especially in the lower grades. Two reasons were given:

1. The regular classroom teacher is the major resource for identification of children with undiagnosed disabilities which create serious academic problems, and

2. Basic information and understanding of the educational problems and needs of the major disability groups would more easily facilitate integration of disabled children into the mainstream of regular classes.

Georgia has recently adopted legislation requiring, for certification, credit in special education for regular teachers and principals in the public schools. The Resource Group felt this to be an appropriate step considering the Rand Corporation estimate that one in ten persons under 21 has a significant disability. The mediocrity of some special education programs cannot be totally blamed on insufficient funding for special education. The value of special education should not be denigrated because of conditions

it was not designed to deal with, but in some cases has been forced to perpetuate.

This report is not intended to be an evaluation of special education, but to point out problems in the educational development of the disabled. The several areas of concern discussed by the Resource Group indicate a need for in-depth studies and evaluations which are beyond the scope of this report, notably special education, vocational/technical education, and vocational rehabilitation. Re-evaluation in terms of their relationship to each other is also necessary. Presently little communication seems to exist on the administrative level between either the agencies themselves or the academic communities with which they are involved.

TEACHER EDUCATION

RECOMMENDATION 8: *That a curriculum requirement for a degree in teacher education should be a minimum of six (6) credits in identification of learning and physical disabilities.*

REMEDIAL PROGRAM

RECOMMENDATION 9: *That at least one remedial precollege program be developed to meet the specific needs of the major disability groups, and to offer in-service training to personnel with responsibility for services to disabled students at institutions without such a program.*

ADMISSIONS BARRIERS

Admissions testing for disabled individuals should be used with caution or not at all. Test conditions are difficult, if not impossible, to standardize. A student with paralyzed hands may require a proctor just as a blind individual or a deaf person may require an interpreter. All three, equally intelligent and capable, may have scores which scatter significantly in results. The blind testee may do poorly on the math section, the deaf one on the verbal section, and the paralyzed testee may require more time. ETS will not validate scores for any of the three. If tests are used, it is important that admissions personnel who process applications be aware of such problems and familiar with tests which have been developed for specific disabilities and which have some degree of validation.

Admissions testing, and, in fact, testing in general, was identified by the Resource Group Subcommittee on the Blind as a concern in regard to media used and time limitations. SAT, GRE, Miller Analogy and other traditional admissions tests are questionable at best and invalid at worst as an indication of the capabilities of blind individuals. Caution is also urged in the evaluation of I.Q. scores. Counselors to the blind indicate that permanent secondary school records often contain erroneous information based on such tests as the Otis I.Q. tests. The Otis group test, which is not valid for the blind, is often given in the public schools and blind students are often urged to take it. Counselors

of clients with supposedly low I.Q.'s have found the Otis test is the basis of the assessment. Retesting, using a Stanford-Benet or Wechsler test, on a one-to-one basis gives more accurate and frequently measurable different results. On the Wechsler test, the verbal score is considered valid, the performance score is not, so averaging must be discounted.

It is informative to note that the majority of students responding to the questionnaire indicated that they did not feel they had been discriminated against in applying to college because of their disability, though several related incidents which clearly indicated a different and often more stringent process had been applied to them. One student related that, although he wasn't required to take the GRE's, he would receive an automatic score of 500 if he didn't. The nebulous evaluation of "social immaturity" which might be equally valid for many nondisabled freshmen is not generally a reason for denial of admission to the nondisabled. Neither are multiple interviews.

Admission to college involves interview, applications, special tests and references. These are areas in which hearing-impaired persons have a great deal of difficulty. Oral and/or manual interpreters would be beneficial for hearing-impaired persons applying to colleges and universities to assist these individuals with admissions procedures. The greatest obstacle to the hearing-impaired is the admission test.

Many admissions procedures used in institutions for higher education are inappropriate in determining the probabilities of

success for deaf individuals. This is so because of the inherent language difficulties that deafness imposes on academically capable, intelligent persons. Most admissions procedures depend heavily on the results of tests which are overloaded verbally and on which deaf individuals, in spite of their academic achievements or levels of intelligence, perform poorly.

It is necessary that admission officers and staff understand the limitations of such tests. Although test scores may be below the national norms for hearing persons, some hearing-impaired individuals with outstanding abilities may score comparatively low.

Students with identified perceptual-motor learning disabilities have communication problems in common with both blind and deaf students and should have similar consideration in regard to the admissions process. This has been a major problem for these individuals in gaining access to postsecondary education for two reasons:

1. These individuals are generally not obviously disabled, although learning disability can occur in conjunction with blindness, deafness, or mobility handicaps, and

2. Little communication exists between secondary special education personnel and postsecondary institutions regarding the needs of persons with perceptual-motor learning disabilities. As a result, the majority do poorly in the admission process and are eliminated from consideration even though they may have exceptional potential and intelligence. Like the deaf individual who may have reading and writing problems, the person with a perceptual-

motor disability requires a different manner of communicating his/her knowledge. Often the problem can be minimized by allowing the person to answer questions verbally, using oral rather than visual perception as is required for the blind. The problems with reading and writing exhibited by this group are perceptual in nature and in no way reflect their intellectual capability. This area of disability is widely misunderstood and largely ignored by postsecondary institutions. Students with perceptual-motor disabilities often have been stigmatized as slow learners or underachievers. Awareness of the nature of this type of learning disability has developed on the secondary level, but very little has filtered upward to postsecondary schools in terms of admissions procedures or supportive services.

ELIMINATION OF STANDARDIZED TESTS

RECOMMENDATION 10: *That SAT, GRE, and similar standardized group tests not be used as admissions criteria for evaluating the potential for college of blind, deaf, or learning-disabled (perceptual-motor) applicants.*

WHERE TO START

The provision of special services to disabled students does not necessarily require large expenditures. Much of the difficulty caused by architectural and communications barriers can be significantly reduced by coordination of service at a central, accessible

location by one person in touch with all levels of the administration, faculty, and staff. It is not economically feasible for all postsecondary educational institutions to develop programs for the disabled. While it is important that full-service programs be developed, it is also important that the disabled person not be restricted in his choice of a school by the existence of such a program. Basic services should be available at all institutions.

The designation of one person in the administration or faculty, perhaps someone from the professional counseling staff who is sensitive to the needs of disabled students and can offer beneficial assistance to the individual student as well as to the institution would be valuable. The person chosen for the role of coordinator does not require a background in rehabilitation but should have awareness of the problems of the disabled whether by educational background or experience. Release time from regular duties should be given in relation to the numbers of disabled students who need assistance. It is essential that the designated staff person be given support from the administration of the institution in the coordination of services.

INFORMATION AND ORIENTATION

A student contemplating application to a college generally has access to college catalogs to help him decide which college is right for him. Many disabled students do not have access to this conventional source of information. Most blind students are

unaware of what information is contained in college catalogs because the media is inaccessible. Only one college in the state--Central Connecticut State College--has a braille catalog. Other disabled students require information that is not in the catalog, information about the accessibility of the physical plant, classrooms, dormitories and social areas. It is important that prospective students be as fully informed as possible about what services and difficulties to expect.

The provision of information will be a continuing need, especially for blind and deaf students, if they are not to be isolated to a great extent from the general information about activities and services available to nondisabled students. The coordinator should be available at regular hours. Counselors of agencies which sponsor disabled students should be informed that a contact person is available on the campus and how and when that person can be reached.

The coordinator is in a position to provide and receive information of importance to the welfare of disabled students. For example, obstructions or hazardous conditions on pedestrian walkways can endanger blind and mobility-handicapped students. Information from Physical Plant personnel concerning construction or repairs on roads or walkways should be passed on to students through the coordinator, thus reducing the likelihood of injury-producing accidents. Similarly, notification of campus fire officials of the names and room numbers of disabled students who might need

assistance in an emergency is an important safety precaution. Information is perhaps the most singularly important provision for a disabled student.

PRE-REGISTRATION AND SCHEDULING

Priority registration during the week prior to the regular pre-registration can be a great convenience for blind and mobility-disabled students, or others who may require special scheduling for physical or medical disabilities. Assuring a blind student a specific course or section will allow necessary lead time for the student to obtain book lists and have course materials taped, brailled or otherwise provided in an appropriate media. The mobility-disabled student benefits from such procedures by being able to plan around inaccessible buildings and allow sufficient time between classes to get from one location to another.

One-stop registration is especially important on large campuses and those with numerous physical barriers, to alleviate the problems of waiting in long lines and collecting numerous signatures at different locations. Several of Connecticut's colleges have already instituted one-stop procedures. The coordinator contacts all necessary points by phone and is given the authority to sign registration cards with the approval of the class instructor.

TESTING ARRANGEMENTS

Students with visual impairments, perceptual-motor disabilities, or muscular coordination problems involving the use of hands may require special testing arrangements. Coordinators should provide assistance in a variety of ways for the convenience of both the student and teacher. If time requirements or method of taking the test make it impossible to take the test with the class, the coordinator can assist with alternative arrangements such as a proctor or amanuensis, putting the test on tape, and/or providing a place for the student to take the test in the manner best suited to his needs.

The availability of an electric braillewriter, large-print typewriter, and a tape recorder can provide valuable assistance for testing arrangements. With an electric braillewriter, a sighted typist can produce braille copy as easily as print.

The appropriate media is of major importance if the student is to demonstrate without disadvantage his/her knowledge. A test which is read aloud to a blind student both consumes time and introduces factors which increase difficulty in answering for the student. Memory retention, voice inflection, mental fatigue also create doubt among some faculty members about the validity of the grade received. This was cited by blind students who felt they had been penalized in grading because the professor believed that the presence of a reader indicated they had received assistance in their answers to the test. Braille or large-print tests should be

available to ameliorate such problems. If braille or large print are not available or oral presentation is preferred by blind students, the exam should be taped, the tape checked for bias by the coordinator, and the student assigned to a private room with a typewriter, to take the test. The same methods, but allowing for an oral response on tape, can accommodate students who may be unable to write. These methods of testing require additional time to insure fair testing of the student.

VOLUNTEER SERVICES

A person designated to provide assistance to disabled students is in an ideal position to recruit volunteer readers, typists, note-takers and tutors. Many members of the student body, faculty, and staff are willing to offer their time to assist disabled students, but often are unaware of ways in which they may be of assistance. Some are hesitant to ask the disabled student for fear of offending, and many disabled persons hesitate to ask for assistance out of fear that their request will be considered an imposition. As a result, problems which could have been easily solved become compounded, often with serious academic consequences.

The major problem identified by blind students surveyed for this report was lack of appropriate media at the time it was required. Magnetic tape, braille and large print are the usual choices, with tape being the most widely used.

Textbook materials are generally provided by volunteer agencies such as Recordings for the Blind (RFB) in New York, the Darien Association or the Connecticut Braille Association (CBA), which provides both braille and large-print books. Demand for the services of these volunteer agencies is high, particularly for the fall semester. CBA is particularly busy, since it is the major provider of braille for blind students in all grades of school. Students must order well in advance.

Even if a student has pre-registered and ordered his materials in advance of need, there is no guarantee that they will arrive before classes begin. Delays in delivery are common. A representative answer concerning the receipt of class textbook material was "sometimes before classes begin, usually during and sometimes after the semester."

Another problem cited was that of professors changing book lists just before classes begin so that materials previously ordered were useless. The majority of students responding to the survey cited instances in which they had suffered academically because of being without class texts.

A volunteer reader pool to tape materials until ordered tapes arrive or to provide face-to-face reading can help the student overcome the obvious disadvantages. A list of volunteers and their phone numbers should be maintained, frequently updated, and distributed to visually impaired students.

Contrary to the belief that all students with serious hearing losses are in programs for the deaf, there are many hearing-impaired

students who can and do mainstream in colleges without hearing impairment programs. These are the oral deaf individuals who rely on lip reading. The fact that hearing impairment is not a visible disability has for the most part isolated them from supportive services offered to visibly disabled students and created a basic lack of understanding about their needs. While the hearing impaired student who lip-reads may understand the words of professors whom he may not be able to hear, he cannot watch the professor and also take notes nor can he maintain the continuity of the discussion when the teacher turns his back to the class to write material on the blackboard. Therefore, hearing note-takers are an important service. Note pads are available which make two copies simultaneously. As no two people take notes the same way, at least two sets of notes should be available from students in the class. The notebooks should be available, as should braille paper, in the campus bookstore.

If recording equipment is available, the class should be recorded to avoid the problem of incomplete or confusing notes. Tutors can assist the deaf student in reviewing notes or checking the tape to clarify confusing references in the notes.

A deaf college junior attending classes with hearing students indicated to the Resource Group that the major problem she had encountered was lack of awareness among English teachers. The language problems of deaf children and adults have been previously noted in this report. It is essential that the written communication problems of this group of disabled students be understood and

that tutorial assistance be available to them for written course work. Of all educational disadvantages deafness is the most profound. The coordinator can provide a valuable service to these students by assisting them in obtaining note-takers and tutors.

Tutorial and typing assistance would be helpful for many disabled individuals. Meeting deadlines for course work is a problem for all students. Disabled students have much of their time usurped by arrangements and problems peculiar to their disability. A typing pool can provide them additional time for class work in order to meet the same deadlines as their classmates.

WORK-STUDY

Volunteers, while a valuable resource, are not always dependable, especially during exams when they may be most needed. Work-study students should be screened by the coordinator and employed as readers, tutors, etc.

This is not a complete list of the types of services which can be provided for disabled students at low or no cost. The provision of these and other services does not create a program; however it would be a start at easing some debilitating barriers in our institutions.

SPECIAL SERVICES

RECOMMENDATION 11: *That institutions in the state immediately implement all possible low or no-cost services to the handicapped such as:*

(a) Designation of a qualified individual or office to deal with the special problems of disabled students.

(b) A statement in the catalog summarizing accessibility of the campus, noting particular problems, and the name and address of the person designated to assist disabled persons.

(c) Establishment of pre-registration procedures.

(d) Provision for appropriate parking.

(e) Enforcement of parking regulations with towing for offenders who disregard areas marked for the disabled or who park so as to obstruct ramps, sidewalks or crosswalks.

(f) Enforcement of Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations concerning safety at construction sites in pedestrian areas.

(g) Use of audible and visual signals near hazardous construction areas, and low curbs beveled or black-topped as temporary accessibility measures.

(h) Softening of hydraulic door closures to provide easier access by persons in wheelchairs or on crutches.

The Resource Group believes that these basic services should be available for the disabled student at all higher education institutions in the state to facilitate freedom of choice concern-

ing an educational program which meets each individual's needs. However, many capable disabled students are not able psychologically or physically to cope with an obstacle course of barriers and to compete academically with their nondisabled peers. Disability is time consuming. When study time is depleted by the logistics of moving from place to place, by nonexistent or inappropriate media, or by lack of vital supportive services, disabled students cannot demonstrate their true academic ability. If they drop out or fail, the reason is frequently attributed to their social immaturity, their incompetence, or their disability, and rarely to the environment which has made demands on their time and stamina far beyond that demanded of their nondisabled peers.

FUTURE PLANNING

Priorities for future provisions for the disabled in post-secondary education in Connecticut should include a barrier-free university, a media center, a program for the deaf beyond community college level, and opportunities for deaf, blind, and physically disabled students in technical programs.

The ideal is full accessibility at all of Connecticut's colleges. However, it is realized that even with commitment to full accessibility, the ideal projected into an indeterminate future is impractical to deal with present need, and that available resources may have to be concentrated in one or two institutions. The Resource Group believes that Connecticut should make every

effort to provide and support at least one barrier-free, graduate degree-granting institution with a full range of supportive services.

All programs as well as dormitory facilities and social and recreation facilities offered should be physically accessible to mobility-impaired students. Supportive services should include an adapted transportation vehicle(s), speech and hearing therapy, physical therapy, and medical personnel knowledgeable about rehabilitation medicine.

Excellent programs already exist in other states about which considerable information is available. The experience of institutions such as the University of Illinois, Ohio State University, and others could offer valuable assistance to Connecticut in planning similar services. A factor in program development has been the establishment of Rehabilitation Centers in cooperation with the state's Division of Vocational Rehabilitation so that at least the start-up costs of services were underwritten by the Agency. Discussion between the DVR and the CHE is recommended to explore the potential of such an arrangement at one of Connecticut's educational institutions. Other existing programs have been developed with other sources of funds. The important point is that while funds, state, federal, or institutional, may not be readily available to provide a barrier-free institution or a full range of supportive services immediately, a concerted effort to identify and attract such funds should be made. Funding has been discussed in the beginning of this report and will not be

repeated here.

The urgency of meeting the media needs of the blind cannot be over-emphasized. While the majority of blind college students surveyed indicated that the agencies were responsive to the students' needs, virtually all students surveyed who relied on the agencies indicated that they had suffered academically because of media-related problems. Several cited a history of incompletes resulting from text materials arriving late.

Tape recordings are the most widely used form of media for blind students for two reasons: tape is compact, braille is bulky and expensive. Because of the expense of braille transcription the Board of Education Services For the Blind limits payment for braille texts to math, science, or foreign language materials. Many students surveyed, however, cited a need or preference for braille materials. Tape was cited as inappropriate for certain class work such as poetry analysis, where braille could reproduce the line forms of print.

The problems of being without necessary texts, or having inappropriate media is further aggravated by lack of access to reference and resource materials unless someone is available for face-to-face reading and research. There are thousands of texts available from RFB but the index is not in braille. Books are listed by author and title, and by very general subject heading. A complaint is that the subject headings are so general that they are virtually useless for research purposes. The blind student

researching a topic must use reference materials and the card catalog with a reader, to obtain specific titles and then work backward to the RFB catalog to establish whether tapes are available. Even then the student may have to contact RFB because accessions lists are generally not current.

Cataloging and production of media would seem to be areas which lend themselves to technological solutions. Taping and braille printing are still done primarily on a one-to-one basis by readers and transcribers at RFB or CBA. Several collections in the various media forms exist but are not readily available to the student and duplication of services often occurs. Other states have attempted to meet these needs in a variety of ways.

Extensive media services are provided for blind students through the Rehabilitation Education Center at the University of Illinois (Urbana). Tape and braille libraries are maintained which include over 2000 tapes, braille encyclopedias, dictionaries, foreign language dictionaries, logarithmic tables, mathematical tables, music and other materials. Braille and tape transcription, and a free reader service are available. Academic testing is provided in appropriate media and loan equipment, such as braillewriters and tape recorders, is available. Construction of an RFB Recording Studio Lab and cooperative programs with American Printing House for the Blind, Library of Congress and other agencies, and a library exchange program for the blind has been accomplished. These services are part of the university's

statewide program to establish a central media resource for educational materials for the blind. Resources of the center are available to the community.

A less comprehensive but efficient form of media delivery has been developed by "You've Got a Friend," a volunteer organization at the Milwaukee campus of the University of Wisconsin. Most of the services offered are conventional, but the program has two unique features: an arrangement with the telephone company to use a telephone high-speed duplicator, which can do three and one-half hours of taping in 20 minutes, and a campus radio-broadcast reading of the daily newspaper.

A need exists for high-speed braille production. The University of Illinois indicates a demand for braille materials beyond the capability of transcribers even though the University of Illinois has its own transcription service.

The Atlanta Braille Project is a promising example of the use of sophisticated computer technology in the production of braille media. The Project was begun with a federal grant in 1972 after fire destroyed the braille library of the public school system. The computer was used to replenish the library and provide braille media for blind students in the public school system. The computer prints both high and low quality braille at a rate of ten pages a minute. Poetry and play formats can be provided as well as conventional print lines. Some success has been achieved in using compositor's tape to provide braille copy which would eliminate the major cost of producing computerized braille which is for the

time it takes a key-punch operator to copy the required text. When refined, the process will provide the blind with access to any material in machine-readable form, including publishers' tapes of textbooks, novels, journals, newspapers, phone books and other print items.

A computer braille capability does not have to be as complex as the Atlanta Braille Project to be a useful tool both in the provision of media and in offering educational opportunity not presently available in programs in which the use of the computer is essential or desirable. Blind students desiring computer service programs are frequently trained twice, once to receive a degree, and again at a computer school. The DOTSYS II Braille Program and Braille Embosser developed at MIT could offer efficiency of service and opportunities in technical and graduate education to every blind student in the state. Little investigation has been done into the potential of PLATO systems and remote terminals which could receive media by teletype from a central source. As a tool for the delivery of educational media for the blind, development of a remote capability would have significance for all libraries in the state and region in provision for the disabled.

A state media center to produce braille, tape, and large-print media for the blind would also serve other groups of disabled students, notably the physically disabled student with impairment of arms and hands and students with perceptual-motor disabilities, both of which may require tapes. Many educational needs of the

deaf can be accommodated by technology, especially by videotape, which as an educational aid can enable a deaf student to pick up in a tutorial session material missed in class. Educational TV programs for the deaf can offer continuing education for the deaf community that is presently unavailable to them.

Conventional modes of education exclude many individuals from full participation in the educational process. The Resource Group strongly advocates investigation into the potential of technology to provide alternatives to that exclusion.

Very few deaf individuals are accepted into postsecondary education, and fewer into postsecondary institutions for hearing students. The higher education community must bear major responsibility for the isolation of the deaf. Programs such as the one established at Northwestern Connecticut Community College have demonstrated the ability of deaf students if given appropriate supportive services to compete adacemically with hearing peers. The need for postsecondary education opportunities for the deaf is a major one. As John A. Sessions, labor authority of the AFL-CIO Union, predicted in 1966: "...Within ten years, unemployment among deaf workers will approximate 70 percent, and most of the remaining 30 percent will be dead-ended in various unskilled and menial jobs."[21] The shift in the labor market to white collar and service professions, the increasing level of education required for entry-level positions and the advance of technology have eliminated many jobs for which deaf individuals were traditionally trained.

White collar and service areas are those in which the deaf person is considered least prepared by aptitude and educational background. Educational background may well be the basis of the deaf persons "aptitude" because it is easier to show a deaf person a manual skill than to teach him to speak or write. A myth that has developed from this is that deaf individuals are incapable of abstract thought. Another erroneous impression of the deaf is that his poor verbal ability is indicative of a low intelligence. Deaf individuals have the same range of intellectual capabilities as normally hearing individuals. However, they have not been challenged academically or provided with the educational support to allow them to compete.

Connecticut has a substantial number of deaf children who will be seeking career training in the near future. If these are not to be dead-ended educationally, programs must be developed to prepare them for the job market. "The answer lies in using the potential that is there and has been largely untapped. It lies in providing educational opportunities that through the use of tested communication (including manual and oral), audio-visual techniques, and qualified specialists become opportunities in the true sense of breaking through the communication barrier of deafness and freeing the intellectual capacity of the deaf person. This, coupled with counseling that aids the deaf client in matching his unique combination of assets, liabilities and interests with appropriate positions in terms of current and projected demands of the world of work, can overcome what is otherwise extremely dim prognosis."[22]

Connecticut can boast about its one postsecondary program for the deaf. Deaf students who choose an academic rather than career program have no transfer-track to a four-year, degree-granting college except one of the colleges for the deaf, if they require an interpreter and intensive tutorial assistance to help them compensate for the educational disadvantages of deafness.

All Resource Group Subcommittees were concerned about the lack of opportunity for the disabled in vocational technical training. Architectural barriers and lack of supportive services at the state vocational training schools and colleges severely limit opportunities in technical education, and the opportunity to acquire high-level skills necessary to compete in the job market for a viable wage rather than subsistance level pay and dead-end jobs.

SERVICES FOR THE BLIND AND DEAF

RECOMMENDATION 12: *That a state coordinator for services to blind and deaf individuals be identified for purposes of counseling; providing information about programs and services; organizing media, reader, interpreter and other support services on the postsecondary level, and acting as liaison with the secondary schools.*

RECOMMENDATION 13: *That the Commission for Higher Education undertake a feasibility study of a cooperative library network on the postsecondary level for a statewide or regional media center, and that this media center provide appropriate media to blind and deaf college students throughout the state (i.e. recording, tape duplicating, large print, and computer braille).*

RECOMMENDATION 14: *That the program for the deaf at Northwestern Community College be continued by the state at the termination of its federal grant.*

RECOMMENDATION 15: *That a transfer track for the deaf with supportive services be established at a four-year, degree-granting institution.*

RECOMMENDATION 16: *That a minimum of one technical college provide supportive services to meet the needs of blind, deaf and physically disabled students.*

NOTES

1. Eunice Fiorito Awareness Week Speech, University of Connecticut April 17, 1975.

2. *The Goal Is Mobility,* Social Rehabilitation Services, HEW, 1969 p. 62.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid., p. 63.

5. Testimony before Connecticut General Assembly, General Law Committee, Subcommittee on Architectural Barriers, Public Hearing Concerning Adoption of ANSI Standards, March, 1975.

6. *The Goal Is Mobility*, p. 23.

7. Quoted in *New York Times*, "About New York," section, Feb. 19, 1975.

8. Connecticut Board of Education Services to the Blind, 1974, Caseload Statistics.

9. State Library for the Blind and Physically Handicapped Resource Group.

10. Report of Subcommittee on the Deaf, submitted by Dr. Peter Owsley, Chairman.

11. *A State Plan for Special Education*, Section I, Table I-1 State Dept. of Education, Hartford, Conn.

12. Connecticut Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, 1974 Caseload Statistics

13. Connecticut State Health Department Division of Crippled Children, compiled by Dr. Harold Lipton, M.D., based on the national estimate of the prevalance of types of disability, 1970.

14. Report for Resource Group Subcommittee on Minorities, prepared by the Bureau of Community and Institutional Services, DVR, based on the 1974 Annual Report of the Advisory Committee on the Handicapped, HEW.

15. *Characteristics of Clients Rehabilitated in Fiscal Years 1968-1972*, Division of Monitoring and Program Analysis, Statistical Analysis and Systems Branch, HEW, SRS. pp. 7 and 13.

16. Based on Division of Vocational Rehabilitation Counselor Caseload Review prepared for Office of Special Student Services, University of Connecticut, 1973.

17. Kent B. Kloepping, Ed.D "The Need for Special Services in Postsecondary Educational Programs for Physically Handicapped Students" (White Paper prepared for the National Task Force on the Disadvantaged and Postsecondary Education). University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, pp. 9-10.

18. Ibid., p. 5.

19. Office of Legislative Research, Connecticut General Assembly "The Administration of Service Delivery Programs in Special Education in Five Connecticut Towns: The Organization and Coordination of the Planning and Placement Team Process," pp. 2, 3.

20. Ibid., p. 35.

21. Edith Miller and Ernest I. Bentley, *Listen to the Sounds of Deafness*, Supplementary Educational Center, Metropolitan Atlanta Region, Atlanta, Georgia, p. 26 (reprinted by National Association of the Deaf, May, 1970).

22. Ibid., pp. 31, 32.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Accessibility of Texas Higher Education to the Mobility Impaired, A Survey of Facilities and Services, Prepared for Texas Legislative Council Study Committee on Programs for the Handicapped. Center for Human Resources, College of Business Administration, University of Houston, Houston, Texas, 1973.

Affirmative Action to Employ Handicapped People. (how the new law on federal contracts affects the employer/protects the job-seeker and employee). Labor Standards Administration, Boston, Mass., 1975.

American National Standard Specifications for Making Buildings and Facilities Accessible to and Usable by the Physically Handicapped, American National Standards Institute, 1430 Broadway, New York, N. Y. ANSI A117.1-1961 (R1971). Available from the Easter Seal Society.

Anderson, Gary B., and Rogers, David W., "An Inexpensive Braille Terminal Device," Communications of the ACM, Vol. 11, No. 6, June, 1968.

142nd Annual Report of Perkins School for the Blind, Watertown, Mass., 1973.

Application Information and Program Manual, Talent Search, Upward Bound, Special Services, HEW, 1973.

Brown, Betty A., "The Forgotten Minority in the Community College Environment: Meeting the Needs of the Physically Disabled at the Three Miami-Dade Community College Campuses, Miami, Florida," (unpublished paper) Miami-Dade Community College, North Campus, Miami, Florida, 1973.

Campus Guide for the Physically Disabled. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass., 1973.

Characteristics of Clients Rehabilitated In Fiscal Years 1968-1972: Federal-State Rehabilitation Program, prepared by Division of Monitoring and Program Analysis, Statistical Analysis and Systems Branch, HEW, SRS, RSA

Cleveland, Herman. "Walls Do Not a College Make," Reprinted from the December 1974 issue of *Connecticut Business and Industry.*

Computer Braille Capabilities in the Atlanta Public School System, Atlanta Public Schools, July, 1973.

Early Childhood Project Newsletter, Education Commission of the States, No. 14, Denver, Colorado, Sept. 1974.

Equal Educational Opportunity for the Handicapped. (Survey of physical barriers with recommendations for renovations and/or additions to existing buildings...) West Chester State College Dept. of Education, Feb. 1974.

General Statement on Facilities and Services, Division of Rehabilitation-Education Services, Rehabilitation-Education Center, University of Illinois.

Gust, Tim and McGowan, John F. *Preparing Higher Education Facilities for Handicapped Students* (Final Report prepared for the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, HEW, for Research and Demonstration grant RD-629) University of Missouri, 1968.

Handbook for Disabled Students, Student Government and the University Administration, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Fla., 1973.

Kloepping, Kent B., Ed. D "The Need for Special Services in Postsecondary Education Programs for Physically Handicapped Students" for the National Task Force on the Disadvantaged and Postsecondary Education. University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz., 1974.

Lauder, Ruth. *The Goal Is: Mobility!* (Environmental and Transportation Barriers Encountered by the Disabled) Published for the National Citizen's Conference on Rehabilitation of the Disabled and Disadvantaged, HEW, SRS, Washington, D.C., 1969.

Laurie, Gini and Joe eds. *Rehabilitation Gazette,* Vol. XVII, St. Louis, Mo., 1974, pp. 21-23, 25, 27.

Making Colleges and Universities Accessible to Handicapped Students, (Architectural Checklist) State University Construction Fund, Albany N. Y. Reprinted by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Miller, Edith and Bently, Ernest I. *Listen to the Sounds of Deafness,* Supplementary Educational Center, Metropolitan Atlanta Region, Atlanta, Ga. Reprinted by National Association of the Deaf, May, 1970.

Mobility for Handicapped Students. HEW, SRS, 1968.

Norris, Arthur G. Ed. *Deafness,* Vol. II, Professional Rehabilitation Workers with the Adult Deaf, Inc., Silver Spring, Ind., 1972.

Nugent, Timothy J. *Design of Buildings to Permit Their Use by the Physically Handicapped.* Reproduced from New Building Research, Fall 1960, Publication No. 910, Building Research Institute, National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council, for distribution by the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults, and the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Office of Legislative Research. "The Administration of Service Delivery Programs in Special Education in Five Connecticut Towns, The Organization and Coordination of the Planning and Placement Team Process" Interim Report to the Education Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly, 1974.

Postsecondary Accommodation of Physically Handicapped Persons: An Overview. Intercampus Committee for Handicapped Students, Boston, Mass.

"Services for the Blind and Visually Handicapped," Division of Rehabilitation-Education Service, Rehabilitation Center of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.

State Plan for Special Education, Vol. I, Sections I-II. The Bureau of Pupil Personnel & Special Education Services, State Department of Education, Hartford, Conn. 1974.

Stewart, Larry G., ed. *Perspectives in Education of the Deaf.* Proceedings of National Forum V, Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf, Memphis, Tenn., 1972.

Stuckless, E. Ross, ed. *Principles Basic to the Establishment and Operation of Postsecondary Programs for Deaf Students: Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf, June, 1973.*

"Study of the Removal of Architectural Barriers to Use by the Handicapped at Institutions of Higher Learning" (Report to the Legislature By Board of Educational Finance) New Mexico, January, 1973.

Survey of Accessibility of Facilities for the Physically Handicapped at the University of Delaware. Newark, Del., 1974.

Sweitzer, Mary E. and Williams Boyce, "Life Problems of Deaf People," reprinted from the Archives of Environmental Health, August 1967, Vol. 15, Copyright 1967, American Medical Association.

Vocational Education Evaluation Report Fiscal Year 1972, Prepared by the Connecticut Advisory Council on Vocational Education.

Vocational Education Evaluation Report Fiscal Year 1973, Prepared by the Connecticut Advisory Council on Vocational Education

With You in Mind, Educational Rehabilitation Services, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

RESPONSES TO MOBILITY SURVEY

I. Excerpts from letters received from Departments of Education, Higher Education Commissions, Boards and Councils in Other States.

Florida (State University System)

"During the last several years, all of the universities in the State University System of Florida have made efforts to meet the needs of physically disabled students. By way of example, the Handbook for Disabled Students at Florida State University, is enclosed."

Florida (Division of Community Colleges)

"...The Community Colleges have been active both system wide and within individual schools in attempting to create awareness on campus for needs of handicapped students. The Council of Academic Deans, Council of Student Deans, and Council of Business Deans have had as part of their quarterly program a presentation on providing services for handicapped students."

Louisiana

"(Also) Delgado Junior College, New Orleans...has an outstanding rehabilitation center on the campus and has made significant progress in integrating the physically handicapped into the regular program. I have seen a performance by their Theatre of the Deaf and was most impressed."

Michigan

"We have established with each of the financial aid officers at Michigan's higher education institutions a procedure for the coordination of benefits so that we do not duplicate the funds available from loan and scholarship programs. We also require a calculation of the unmet financial need and restrict our support to that dollar calculation. We do, however, adjust the unmet need figure to reflect those peculiar and unusual costs that are related to the nature of the handicapping condition. For example, a deaf student might require interpreter services,

the cost of which would be peculiar to the nature of the disability. Such costs would be provided for above and beyond the unmet need calculation determined by the local institution's financial aid officer."

"Three of our universities have established Offices of Handicapped Affairs...Michigan State University, the University of Michigan, and Wayne State University."

"Through our network of community colleges and area vocational technical centers, postsecondary vocational training programs are being offered to handicapped individuals. Much of the impetus for this has been stimulated by the Vocational Education Service of the Department."

Minnesota

"(However), several of the state's postsecondary education institutions have undertaken efforts to serve the disabled. Southwest Minnesota State College in Marshall, Minnesota, for example, is nationally recognized for its specially designed facilities for the handicapped."

Missouri

"Let me say at the outset that many of our public and private institutions of higher education make special provisions for the disabled student. While the costs for these special provisions are usually absorbed directly by the institution, there are a number of programs which have made federal funds available through our Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (Office of Vocational Education...Office of Vocational Rehabilitation)...

1. East Central Junior College...twenty-five percent of the vocational funding goes to the handicapped area
2. Longview Community College...essentially deals with clerical office training for the handicapped, including hard of hearing, sight impaired, speech defects and cripples (physically handicapped)...Fifty percent of the vocational education funding for this program goes to the handicapped.

. . . . . .

"In 1961 the University of Missouri received a federal grant to adapt their facilities to the handicapped...This program, the cost of which is now absorbed by the University, makes use of many different special facilities...."

New Hampshire

"Presently the New Hampshire Vocational-Technical College in Claremont is implementing a plan whereby deaf students are enrolled in an ongoing one and two year occupational program. In certain instances, deaf students have an opportunity to explore various occupational fields before making a curriculum choice."

New Mexico

"For the past three years this office in cooperation with the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation has been engaged in an effort to remove architectural barriers to handicapped persons at higher education institutions. At this point in time, we estimate that we have completed or have operational, projects that will result in the removal of only about 25 percent of the architectural barriers at the public institutions of higher education. This process has been slowed because of the limited funds available and the extensive building alterations that are often required."

North Carolina

"The 16 campuses of the The University of North Carolina (also) are expending substantial funds to make existing buildings accessible to the physically handicapped..."

Oklahoma

"...all institutions of higher education in Oklahoma are moving toward the removal of all barriers which would inhibit the full participation of physically disabled students in the programs of the colleges...Many of our campuses have completely eliminated architectural barriers...most institutions...provide varying levels of assistance such as special counseling and therapy."

South Carolina

"Act No. 174, 1963, provides standards and specifications for building to ensure accessibility by handicapped persons. Act No. 1191, 1974,rescinds Act. No. 174, 1963, but it is my understanding that the standards and specifications will be carried forward by the Board for Barrier Free Design. The 1974 Act tightens up the provision for exceptions which was considered a major weakness of the 1963 Act."

Texas

"In response to your request for materials regarding how the educational needs of the physically handicapped are handled in the Texas higher education system, we have asked the Texas Legislative Council to send you the following two publications:

Accessibility of Texas Higher Education for the Mobility Impaired, Texas Legislative Council, 1973.

Guide to the University of Texas of Austin for the Mobility Impaired."

II. Excerpts from letters and materials received from institutions concerning their programs.

Arizona

"At the University of Arizona, the service program is within the Rehabilitation Center, which is part of the College of Education. This particular positioning allows for the complete range of services of the Rehabilitation Center being available to Special Services students. These include physical therapy, occupational therapy, hearing evaluation, vocational evaluation and testing, psychological testing and functional physical evaluation. These services became available through a joint policy decision on the part of the University Health Service, the State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Center itself."

"This is the second year that Arizona State University has had an office to aid incoming and enrolled disabled students... services...developed include...week-long orientation program for incoming disabled students (freshmen and transfer)...Funding to eliminate architectural barriers has been obtained from the State Department of Economic Security, and the Board of Regents...renovating residence halls...putting in elevators in the last two academic buildings that did not have them as yet...braille maps...developed by our Geography Department... part-time wheel-chair repair service...person working twenty hours a week with disabled students in the Intramural/Club Sports/Recreation Department."

California

University of California at Berkeley

"The five-year old program, one of the eight on college campuses financed by the division of special services of the U.S. Office of Education, provides information and assistance to 400 students at Berkeley--120 of them confined to wheel-chairs.... In addition, the Berkeley program recently received $231,000 in state and federal grants to offer its graduates on-campus trainee positions at the managerial level and to operate a full-time placement office.

University of Illinois

"The University of Illinois Rehabilitation-Education Program and Rehabilitation-Education Center make it possible for properly qualified individuals with severe, permanent, physical disabilities to pursue a higher education and to benefit from all related experiences which are so much a part of a college education and common to all other students. In providing for the general welfare of disabled students the Program coordinates all facilities, services, and functions for the realization of each individual's vocational objective without the neglect of his physical, emotional, and social development. The Program is concerned with all components of the broad scheme of rehabilitation, attaching equal significance to administration, policy, facilities, teaching, counseling, therapies, adapted sports and recreation, transportation, safety, legal aspects, finance, public orientation and education.

Black Hawk College

"Accessibility of the new campus (Quad Cities Campus) is the result of careful planning and design. Doors were made wide enough to permit the passage of wheelchairs, elevators were installed, but perhaps the most unique and practical feature of the campus is the tunnel system which connects all the buildings."

APPENDIX B

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT

Public Law 93-112
93rd Congress, H. R. 8070
September 26, 1973

An Act

To replace the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, to extend and revise the authorization of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services, with special emphasis on services to those with the most severe handicaps, to expand special Federal responsibilities and research and training programs with respect to handicapped individuals, to establish special responsibilities in the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for coordination of all programs with respect to handicapped individuals within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act, with the following table of contents, may be cited as the "Rehabilitation Act of 1973":

Rehabilitation Act of 1973.
87 STAT. 355

87 STAT. 356

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Sec. 2. Declaration of purpose.
Sec. 3. Rehabilitation Services Administration.
Sec. 4. Advance funding.
Sec. 5. Joint funding.
Sec. 6. Consolidated rehabilitation plan.
Sec. 7. Definitions.
Sec. 8. Allotment percentage.
Sec. 9. Audit.
Sec. 10. Nonduplication.

TITLE I—VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

PART A—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 100. Declaration of purpose; authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 101. State plans.
Sec. 102. Individualized written rehabilitation program.
Sec. 103. Scope of vocational rehabilitation services.
Sec. 104. Non-Federal share for construction.

PART B—BASIC VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION SERVICES

Sec. 110. State allotments.
Sec. 111. Payments to States.
Sec. 112. Client assistance.

PART C—INNOVATION AND EXPANSION GRANTS

Sec. 120. State allotments.
Sec. 121. Payments to States.

PART D—COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE NEEDS

Sec. 130. Special study.

TITLE II—RESEARCH AND TRAINING

Sec. 200. Declaration of purpose.
Sec. 201. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 202. Research.
Sec. 203. Training.
Sec. 204. Reports.

TITLE III—SPECIAL FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Sec. 300. Declaration of purpose.
Sec. 301. Grants for construction of rehabilitation facilities.
Sec. 302. Vocational training services for handicapped individuals.
Sec. 303. Mortgage insurance for rehabilitation facilities.
Sec. 304. Special projects and demonstrations.
Sec. 305. National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults.
Sec. 306. General grant and contract requirements.

21-911 O - 73

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

TITLE IV—ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM AND PROJECT EVALUATION

Sec. 400. Administration.
Sec. 401. Program and project evaluation.
Sec. 402. Obtaining information from Federal agencies.
Sec. 403. Authorization of appropriations.
Sec. 404. Reports.
Sec. 405. Secretarial responsibility.
Sec. 406. Sheltered workshop study.
Sec. 407. State allocation study.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 500. Effect on existing laws.
Sec. 501. Employment of handicapped individuals.
Sec. 502. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board.
Sec. 503. Employment under Federal contracts.
Sec. 504. Nondiscrimination under Federal grants.

87 STAT. 356

87 STAT. 357

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The purpose of this Act is to provide a statutory basis for the Rehabilitation Services Administration, and to authorize programs to—

(1) develop and implement comprehensive and continuing State plans for meeting the current and future needs for providing vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals and to provide such services for the benefit of such individuals, serving first those with the most severe handicaps, so that they may prepare for and engage in gainful employment;

(2) evaluate the rehabilitation potential of handicapped individuals;

(3) conduct a study to develop methods of providing rehabilitation services to meet the current and future needs of handicapped individuals for whom a vocational goal is not possible or feasible so that they may improve their ability to live with greater independence and self-sufficiency;

(4) assist in the construction and improvement of rehabilitation facilities;

(5) develop new and innovative methods of applying the most advanced medical technology, scientific achievement, and psychological and social knowledge to solve rehabilitation problems and develop new and innovative methods of providing rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals through research, special projects, and demonstrations;

(6) initiate and expand services to groups of handicapped individuals (including those who are homebound or institutionalized) who have been underserved in the past;

(7) conduct various studies and experiments to focus on long neglected problem areas;

(8) promote and expand employment opportunities in the public and private sectors for handicapped individuals and to place such individuals in employment;

(9) establish client assistance pilot projects;

(10) provide assistance for the purpose of increasing the number of rehabilitation personnel and increasing their skills through training; and

APPENDIX C

EXCERPT FROM TRIO PROGRAM MANUAL

LEGISLATION

Special Programs for Students From Disadvantaged Backgrounds

"PROGRAM AUTHORIZATION

"Sec. 417A. (a) The Commissioner shall, in accordance with the provisions of this subpart, carry out a program designed to identify qualified students from low-income families, to prepare them for a program of postsecondary education, and to provide special services for such students who are pursuing programs of postsecondary education.

"(b) For the purpose of enabling the Commissioner to carry out this subpart, there are authorized to be appropriated $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for each of the succeeding fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1975.

"AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES

"Sec. 417B. (a) The Commissioner is authorized (without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5)) to make grants to, and contracts with, institutions of higher education, including institutions with vocational and career education programs, combinations of such insitutions, public and private agencies and organizations (including professional and scholarly associations), and, in exceptional cases, secondary schools and secondary vocational schools, for planning, developing, or carrying out within the States one or more of the services described in section 417A(a).

"(b) Services provided through grants and contracts under this subpart shall be specifically designed to assist in enabling youths from low-income families who have academic potential, but who may lack adequate secondary school preparation or who may be physically handicapped, to enter, continue, or resume a program of postsecondary education, including--

"(1) programs, to be known as 'Talent Search', designed to--

"(A) identify qualified youths of financial or cultural need with an exceptional potential for postsecondary educational training and encourage them to complete secondary

school and undertake postsecondary educational training,

"(B) publicize existing forms of student financial aid, including aid furnished under this title, and

"(C) encourage secondary-school or college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude to reenter educational programs, including postsecondary-school programs;

"(2) programs, to be known as 'Upward Bound', (A) which are designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school and (B) in which enrollees from low-income backgrounds and with inadequate secondary-school preparation participate on a substantially full-time basis during all or part of the program;

"(3) programs, to be known as 'Special Services for Disadvantaged Students', of remedial and other special services for students with academic potential (A) who are enrolled or accepted for enrollment at the institution which is the beneficiary of the grant or contract, and (B) who, by reason of deprived educational, cultural, or economic background, or physical handicap, are in need of such services to assist them to initiate, continue, or resume their postsecondary education; and

"(4) a program of paying up to 75 per centum of the cost of establishing and operating Educational Opportunity Centers which--

"(A) serve areas with major concentrations of low-income populations by providing, in coordination with other applicable programs and services--

"(i) information with respect to financial and academic assistance available for persons in such areas desiring to pursue a program of postsecondary education;

"(ii) assistance to such persons in applying for admission to institutions, at which a program of postsecondary education is offered, including preparing necessary applications for use by admission and financial aid officers; and

"(iii) counseling services and tutorial and other necessary assistance to such persons while attending such institutions; and

"(B) serve as recruiting and counseling pools to coordinate resources and staff efforts of institutions of higher education and of other institutions offering programs of postsecondary education, in admitting educationally disadvantaged persons. The portion of the cost of any project assisted under clause (4) in the preceding sentence which is borne by the applicant shall represent an increase in expenditure by such applicant for the purposes of such project.

"(c) Enrollees who are participating on an essentially full-time basis in one or more services being provided under this section may be paid stipends, but not in excess of $30 per month except in exceptional cases as determined by the Commissioner."

(2) The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall be effective after June 30, 1972.

APPENDIX D

EXCERPT FROM PUBLIC LAW 90-576 - VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

"PART C - RESEARCH AND TRAINING IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

"AUTHORIZATION OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

"Sec. 131. (a) From 50 per centum of the sums available to each State for the purposes of this part the Commissioner is authorized to make grants to and contracts with institutions of higher education, public and private agencies and institutions, State boards, and, with the approval of the appropriate State board, to local educational agencies in that State for the purposes set forth in section 132, except that no grant may be made other than to a nonprofit agency or institution.

"(b) The remaining 50 per centum of the sums available to each State for the purposes of this part shall be used by its State board, in accordance with its State plan, (1) for paying up to 75 per centum of the costs of the State research coordination unit, and (2) for grants to colleges and universities, and other public or nonprofit private agencies and institutions, and local educational agencies and contracts with private agencies, organizations, and institutions to pay 90 per centum of the costs of programs and projects for (i) research and training programs, (ii) experimental, developmental, or pilot programs developed by such institutions and agencies and designed to meet the special vocational needs of youths, particularly youths in economically depressed communities who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in the regular vocational education programs, and (3) the dissemination of information derived from the foregoing programs or from research and demonstrations in the field of vocational education, which programs and projects have been recommended by the State research coordination unit or by the State Advisory Council."

SOURCE: CHE Facilities Inventory, Fall 1974 (limited response)

APPENDIX E

ACCESSIBILITY OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

Institution Name	Number of Buildings	Number Multi-Storied	Number of Elevators	Access[1]	Public Phones Accessible[2]	Wheelchair Ramps	Toilets[3]
INDEPENDENT COLLEGES							
Albertus Magnus	24	20	3	U	-*	N	N
Connecticut College	101	68	3	2U, 1R	-*	Y-1	Y-1
Fairfield University	18	17	12	11U, 1R	-*	-*	-*
Hartford College	23	22	-*	-*	Y-1	N	Y-1
Post Junior College	13	13	-*	-*	Y-10	N	Y-10
University of New Haven	11	10	2	U	-*	Y-9	Y-2
PUBLICLY SUPPORTED COLLEGES							
University of Connecticut							
Storrs - Main Campus **	188	120	62	1U	Y-1	Y-41	Y-13
Two-year Branches							
Hartford	1	1	1	U	Y-2	Y	Y
West Hartford[4]	3	2	1	U	Y-2	Y	Y-1
So. Eastern	28	12	3	2U	-	Y-20	Y-2
Stamford	2	2	2	U	Y-1	Y-2	Y-1
Torrington	3	2	-*	-*	-*	Y-1	-*
Waterbury	5	5	1	U	-*	Y-1	Y-1
Professional Schools[4]							
Marine Science Institute	8	5	1	-*	-*	Y-2	Y-1
Old Sch. of Social Work	2	1	-*	-*	-*	Y-1	N
Sch. of Ins. and MBA	1	1	-*	-*	-*	N	-*

1. ACCESS REFERS TO ELEVATORS ONLY. U = UNRESTRICTED ACCESS. R = RESTRICTED ACCESS.
2. NUMBER OF PHONES WHICH CAN BE REACHED IN A WHEELCHAIR.
3. FACILITIES WHICH ARE ATTAINABLE BY THE HANDICAPPED.
4. THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK AND SCHOOL OF LAW ARE INCLUDED IN THE WEST HARTFORD BRANCH.

-* NONE INDICATED.
Y = YES; N = NO

** PARTIAL

APPENDIX E

SOURCE: CHE Facilities Inventory, Fall 1974 (limited response)

ACCESSIBLITY OF EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES
(CONTINUED)

Institution Name	Number of Buildings	Number Multi-Storied	Number of Elevators	Access [1]	Public Phones Accessible [2]	Wheelchair Ramps	Toilets [3]
Regional Community Clgs.							
Housatonic	1	1	-*	-*	-*	Y-1	N
Manchester	15	1	-*	-*	Y-5	Y-3	Y-9
Mattatuck	14	2	-*	-*	-*	N	N
Middlesex	7	2	2	R	-*	Y-1	Y-3
Northwestern Connecticut	9	6	1	U	-*	Y-3	Y-1
Quinebaug Valley	8	1	1	R	-*	N	Y-1
State Colleges							
Central Connecticut	41	39	18	14U, 4R	Y-26	Y-35	Y-27
Western Connecticut	12	11	9	8U, 1R	N	Y-5	Y-3
Technical Colleges							
Hartford State	2	2	2	R	-*	Y-2	Y-2
Waterbury State	2	2	-*	-*	1	N	N
Norwalk State	3	2	-*	-*	Y-1	N	N
Federal							
Coast Guard Academy	26	26	8	3U, 3R	Y-1	Y-3	Y-3

1. ACCESS REFERS TO ELEVATORS ONLY. U = UNRESTRICTED ACCESS. R = RESTRICTED ACCESS.
2. NUMBER OF PHONES WHICH CAN BE REACHED IN A WHEELCHAIR.
3. FACILITIES WHICH ARE ATTAINABLE BY THE HANDICAPPED.
4. THE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK AND SCHOOL OF LAW ARE INCLUDED IN THE WEST HARTFORD BRANCH.

-* NONE INDICATED.
Y = YES; N = NO